

Appl. No. 09/879,698
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 20 May 2004

Page 7 of 9

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

The Office action rejects:

claims 1-3, 8, 10-14, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Breed et al. (USPA 2002/0005778 (misidentified as USPA 2001/0038344 in the Office action), hereinafter Breed);

claims 4-6, 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Breed and Lee (USP 5,680,123); and

claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Breed, Lee, and Strumolo (USP 6,535,242).

The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-13 depend, and claim 14, upon which claims 15-16 depend, and claim 17, upon which claims 18-21 depend, specifically recite a display surface mounted inside a vehicle for displaying images from at least one camera mounted on the vehicle.

The applicants respectfully maintain that Breed does not teach the applicants claimed invention, and that Breed specifically teaches against the applicants' invention.

Breed teaches the use of infrared transmitters and cameras to detect and identify objects that may be in a driver's blind spot. Breed teaches a simple alarm, such as an LED warning light, audio buzzer, or tactile feedback, or a graphical display of a top-down view of the vehicle with icons representing the vehicle and detected objects around the vehicle (Breed, paragraph [0220]).

Breed does not teach that the image from the cameras should be displayed in the vehicle, as specifically claimed in independent claims 1, 14, and 17, and therefore the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 8, 10-14, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Breed.

Appl. No. 09/879,698
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 20 May 2004

Page 8 of 9

Further, Breed specifically teaches against the display of images from cameras in the vehicle, at paragraph [0007]: "Any system which displays a picture of the object on the screen that is inside the vehicle is also going to confuse the driver". Breed also specifically teaches against systems that change the view that is presented to the driver, at paragraph [0006]: "a system that rotates the mirror [i.e. the view presented to the driver] will make the driver nervous since he or she will not be able to see the scene that he or she is accustomed to seeing". Based on these expressed teachings of Breed, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be lead to the applicants' invention, which does present a picture of the object on a screen that is inside the vehicle, and does facilitate the dynamic changing of this view.

As specifically stated in MPEP 2143:

THE PRIOR ART MUST SUGGEST THE DESIRABILITY OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION ... "In determining the propriety of the Patent Office case for obviousness in the first instance, it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification." *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972).

The applicants respectfully maintain that one of ordinary skill in the art having Breed before him/her would not be motivated to make the proposed combinations of Breed and Lee, or Breed, Lee, and Strumolo as suggested by the Office action, because Breed teaches an alternative to the presentation of camera images within a vehicle, and specifically faults the presentation of such camera images in a vehicle.

Because Breed specifically teaches against the applicants' claimed invention, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 4-6, 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Breed and Lee; and the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Breed, Lee, and Strumolo

Appl. No. 09/879,698
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 20 May 2004

Page 9 of 9

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Attorney
Registration Number 41,508
patents@lawyer.com

1824 Federal Farm Road
Montross, VA 22520
Phone: 804-493-0707
Fax: 215-243-7525